

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 22, 2008, and the notice of non-compliant amendment mailed March 26, 2009. With this Amendment claims 1, 21, 34 and 35 are amended and the remaining claims are unchanged. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 21, 34 and 35 are amended to enhance their readability and to include features that better define the features of the claims. Support for these amendments can be found at least at FIG. 11 of the Specification. No new matter is presented. Entry is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under §102

In item 6 of the Office Action claim 1-3, 9-15, 18-21 and 24-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Getting Results with Microsoft Office Results 97 pages 448-457, 563-573, and new pages 169-178, (hereinafter "Office Results"). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and must respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1 and 34 are directed to substantially similar features. For the purposes of efficiency only the features of claim 1 will be discussed in detail. Claim 1 as amended recites, "determining a relationship between the selected view and the base view...receiving a selection of at least one field of the fields; determining if the selected field is drillable...." These features of claim 1 have been added by amendment, and therefore have not been considered by the Examiner in view of Office Results. However, in order to advance prosecution of the present case, the Applicant reviewed

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004

the Office Results reference, and cannot find any disclosure that refers to selecting a view different from the base view and determining a relationship between the selected view and the base view. Further, the Applicant cannot find any disclosure in Office Results of selecting a field and determining if the selected field is drillable. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Office Results does not disclose the features of claim 1 in its entirety. Thus, claim 1 is believed allowable over Office Results. As claim 34 includes features similar to those of claim 1 claim 34 is also believed allowable over Office Results for the same or similar reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 21 and 35 are directed to substantially similar features. For the purposes of efficiency only the features of claim 21 will be discussed in detail. Claim 21 as amended recites "loading a report definition for the first report containing the selected drill link; determining a relation path associated with the selected drill link...." These features of claim 21 have been added by this amendment, and therefore were not considered by the Examiner in view of Office Results. However, the Applicant notes that Office Results does not disclose loading a report definition and selection a relation path after selecting a drill link in the first report. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Office Results does not disclose all of the features of claim 21 in its entirety. Thus, claim 21 is believed allowable over Office Results. As claim 35 includes features similar to those of claim 21, claim 35 is also believed allowable over Office Results for the same or similar reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional

Type of Response: Amendment

Application Number: 10/765,232

Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

patentable features when considered as a whole. It should be noted that the remarks herein with respect to the patentability of the independent claim(s), render the remaining rejections moot, that is the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Office Results or Savage. Therefore, these rejections have not been separately addressed at this stage but applicants retain the right to do so at a later stage should it become necessary

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: April 27, 2009

By: /Nathan M. Rau/

Nathan M. Rau Reg. No.: 45,466
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 706-6882
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

April 27, 2009
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004